

Harvard Dean Testifies

FOIAb3b

Security Overhaul Urged

Washington

Special to The Christian Science Monitor

Far-reaching criticisms of the government security program and a recommendation for its revision were made today by McGeorge Bundy, dean of the faculty of arts and sciences of Harvard University.

In a statement prepared for delivery today before the subcommittee on reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations in Washington, Mr. Bundy charged that the present security program of the United States "created needless confusion and fear, spreads suspicion far beyond the range of reason, and tends to discourage that confident and eager sense of partnership which has so often distinguished the relationship between American scholars and their government since the days of Benjamin Franklin."

He emphasized he was speaking for himself and not Harvard University.

The program needs "drastic improvement," he said. "A thorough review of our policies and procedures in the field of security is not only desirable but urgent."

He called for an "open and searching study" of the United States security program conducted by "citizens of the highest reputation." He warned that it must be "nonpartisan, sober, and careful" and added: "We should not leave it to the security officers to investigate themselves; if the program is to have the proper public confidence it must be based on the judgment of men who have no axe to grind."

The crux of Mr. Bundy's criticism was contained in his statement. "Real protection of a

really sensitive spot must not be confused with a general effort to safeguard everything against everything."

"Those who had tried to bend national policy from places of trust and those who had reported real secrets to the enemy were the dangerous few," he said. "Against them we need high fences vigilantly guarded." But he emphasized that "this is special work and can only be done well if confined to those few places where policy is made and genuine secrets exist."

Illustrating his point he quoted a distinguished Harvard physicist, J. H. van Vleck: "The moment we start guarding our toothbrushes and our diamond rings with equal zeal, we usually lose fewer toothbrushes but more diamond rings."

"The program has become in effect no program at all," said Mr. Bundy. "It has become a patchwork of the individual judgments of men who too often seem to have only a fragmentary understanding of what they are doing. Even when procedures are superficially fair, the results have frequently been so unreasonable as to suggest that something is deeply wrong."

"The national interest is not served when the security program becomes an instrument of insecurity and mistrust among men of good sense and high character."

What is true of the security program is true of some other government activities, he added. Restriction of mailing of Soviet documents, he continued, does not protect anybody from "anything but boredom," yet it is a boon to the party-line propagandist and hampers serious students of the Soviet Union.

Narrow administration of narrow legislation has greatly

limited the free movement of scholars to and from the United States—to such a degree that great international meetings are seldom held, he said.

The general impact of the security program has produced among scholars a distinct reluctance to engage in government work. The harassments of the program make it quite simply not worth while, he added.

Deep in all the "niggling" of the program are the false and dangerous notions that all natural science is full of secrets and that communism is as catching as the plague. "This is the way totalitarians think, but it is not fitting for free men. The fact is that most of science is an open book—hard reading, but open."

"And the fact is, further," he went on, "that in 1955 very few Americans anywhere are easily beguiled by party-line absurdities. It is high time for us to recover from a timidity which has led us to give a worldwide impression that we do not trust ourselves. It is time for us to prove again that when we speak of the free competition of ideas we really mean it."

Earlier, outlining official Harvard policy, Mr. Bundy told the subcommittee that the university avoided engagement in secret government research and did not accept responsibility for administration of security clearances. This was intended to make the greatest possible contribution to the advancement of knowledge and the welfare of the nation.

"The real scientific strength of the country is in free minds, trained by free teachers, and the national defense of the future rests on the depth and strength of open inquiry in many fields," he said.

CPYRGHT